

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 10–35. Claims 10, 11, 16, 19–21, 23, and 32–35 have been amended to further recite the features of the invention. Claims 1–9 have been previously withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. As a result, claims 10–35 are pending for examination with claims 10 and 23 being independent claims. The amendments made find support in the specification and do not constitute new matter.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10–35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nelson et al., (US 2003/0055975) (“Nelson”). Applicants traverse the Examiner’s rejection and point out that, unlike Nelson’s, the Applicants’ “resource” is described in the specification, as would be clear to one skilled in the art, as a virtual (vs physical) resource, potentially comprising objects, that may be retrieved, transmitted, stored, or the like by a computer. None-the-less, in an effort to further prosecution, Applicants have amended the claims to further recite the invention, at least by explicitly claiming a virtual resource.

Applicants have amended independent claim 10 to call for:

“...receiving, from a computing device, a request for the virtual resource, wherein the virtual resource comprises a plurality of objects;... determining a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object;... transmitting a request for the virtual resource...”

(underlining added for emphasis)

Amendment

Application Number: 10/695,928

Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

Further, applicants have amended independent claim 23 to call for:

“...at least one local communication network interface for receiving a request for a virtual resource, wherein the virtual resource comprises a plurality of objects; a plurality of wireless network interfaces for transmitting virtual resource requests over wireless communication connections;... determine a number of objects in the virtual resource and the size of each object; and assign each object to at least one available wireless network interface, at least one object in the virtual resource being assigned a different available wireless network interface than another object in the same virtual resource.” (underlining added for emphasis)

Dependent claims to independent claims 10 or 23 have been also appropriately amended for proper antecedent basis.

As such, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 23, and corresponding dependent claims, are not anticipated by Nelson under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Amendment
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

The present invention specification provides:

“...a request is received to retrieve a resource (e.g., a web page)
that may comprise a plurality of objects.” (para 30, lines 1–2; underlining
added for emphasis)

“...the computing device at the destination address (typically a
server) transmits the resource to the requesting address.” (para 33, lines
9–11; underlining added for emphasis)

“The portions of the resource may be stored in cache memory, or
may be transmitted...” (para 34, lines 5–6; underlining added for
emphasis)

As clearly evident to one skilled in the art, the claimed resource as described in
the specification, and as illustrated by the citations from the specification provided
herein above, is a virtual (vs physical) resource that can be transmitted or retrieved by a
computing device and stored in a cache memory.

Nelson, on the other hand provides:

“The bearer services system components 180 can provide the server 110 with the data connectivity to a plurality of ground-based servers. The bearer services system components 180 may include a plurality of components including an Airborne Communications Unit (ACU) 205, a Wireless Gate-link system (WGS) 182, a Satellite Data Unit (SDU) 195, and a Terrestrial Flight Telephone system (TFTS) 200. The WGS 182 may be, for example, a wireless LAN transceiver (as shown in FIG. 1) based on the IEEE 802.11 specifications which can allow transfer of high-speed data to the server 110 in the airport when the aircraft (moving object) is on the ground. The ACU may act as the gateway to a ground-based data center via the North American Terrestrial System (NATS) network. Although the present invention is described with reference to the NATS network, the NATS network is solely exemplary and alternative communication networks may be used for providing air-to-ground data communication services.” (Nelson, para 30; underlining added for emphasis)

As illustrated by the example citation herein above, Nelson teaches “components” or, as stated by the Examiner, a “bearer service unit” (FOA pg. 2, last para, line 4)—a physical object or objects. As such, Nelson’s “bearer service unit” is fundamentally different than the Applicants’ claimed virtual resource.

Applicants, on the other hand, claim a virtual resource, such as a “web page”; a resource that can be “retrieved... from a remote computer”, “transmitted”, “stored in cache memory”, and the like. Further, as the Applicants’ claimed virtual resource is a virtual entity, any objects of which it is comprised are also virtual entities.

As such, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a virtual resource that can be retrieved, transmitted, or stored by a computer as claimed by the Applicants. Further, Nelson does not disclose, teach, or suggest a virtual entity, such as Applicants’ virtual resource, comprised of other virtual entities, such as Applicants’ objects.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 10 and 23 are not anticipated by Nelson under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). As such, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claims 11–22 are dependent on claim 10. As such, claims 11–22 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon claim 10.

Claims 24–35 are dependent on claim 23. As such, claims 23–35 are believed allowable, at least in part, based upon claim 23.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the above–referenced application is requested.

Amendment
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Amendment

Application Number: 10/695,928

Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01

AMENDMENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: May 29, 2007

By: /L. Alan Collins/

L. Alan Collins, Reg. No.: 57,646
Direct telephone (425) 703-8265
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 29, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Type or Print Name

Amendment
Application Number: 10/695,928
Attorney Docket Number: 304931.01